

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/616,064	JANIK ET AL.
	Examiner Roy M. Punnoose	Art Unit 2877

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) Roy M. Punnoose.

(3) _____

(2) Attorney Jeanette S. Harms (Reg. No. 35,537).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 27 April 2006

Time: 7:15 PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

See below with regard to claim 48

Claims discussed:

48

Prior art documents discussed:

None.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Attorney Jeanette S. Harms.
Attorney Harms agreed to cancel claim 48 because of the ambiguity created by the recitation "cleaning beam and
metrology operation share a common optical path." Upon the examiner's indication of the allowability of the remaining
claims, Attorney Harms opted to cancel claim 48 reserving the right to file a continuation if the applicant decided to do
so. Claim 48 has been cancelled.